



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,429	04/16/2004	Jia-Rong Chang	2019-0250PUS1	9935

2292 7590 06/28/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

MANOHARAN, MUTHUSWAMY GANAPATHY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,429	CHANG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Muthuswamy G. Manoharan	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,6-8,10-12 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,6-8,10-12 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2617

The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1,5,9,13 and 17-19 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (US 2002/0009988) in view of Yoon (US 6675026) and further in view of Wyatt (Christ Church and St John's Parish Magazine, May 2002).

Regarding **claim 2**, Murata teaches a mobile phone (item 3 in Figure 1) providing religious prayers, comprising: a memory module storing at least one set of prayer voice data (Paragraph [0058], lines 5-7); a voice module used to play said set of prayer voice data (Paragraph [0038], lines 1-3, Paragraph [0074], lines 13-15); and a processing module electrically connected to said memory module (Paragraph [0052], lines 1-12) and said voice module and used to retrieve said set of prayer voice data in said memory module to send said set of prayer voice data to said voice module for playback (Paragraph [0071], lines 12-15);

a man-machine interface module (item 41 in Figure 7; Paragraph [0053], lines 1-2) electrically connected to said processing module (item 22 in Figure 7) and having an operation menu (Paragraph [0057], lines 7-8) with a religious prayers item (Paragraph [0057], lines 3-8), said man-machine interface (Paragraph [0053], lines 1-3) being used to set said processing module to play said set of prayer voice data.

Murata did not teach specifically wherein a prayers ring tone item is added to said operation menu of said man-machine interface module to set said processing module to play said set of prayer voice data as the ring tone when said mobile phone has an incoming call.

However, Yoon teaches in an analogous art, wherein a ring tone item is added to said operation menu of said man-machine interface module to set said processing module to play said set of data as the ring tone when said mobile phone has an incoming call (Abstract, lines 1-14). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have mobile phone, wherein a ring tone item is added to said operation menu of said man-machine interface module to set said processing module to play said set of data as the ring tone when said mobile phone has an incoming call. This modification makes the mobile phone user friendly.

Moreover, neither Murata nor Yoon teaches prayers ring tone item. However, Wyatt (page 9) teaches in an analogous art, a prayers ring tone item. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a prayers ring tone item. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have mobile phone with a prayers ring tone item. With this

modification one can avoid embarrassment by not switching off the mobile phone while attending religious services.

Claims 3,4,6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (US 2002/0009988) in view of Yoon (US 6675026 and further in view of Wyatt (Christ Church and St John's Parish Magazine, May 2002) in view of Okada et al. (hereinafter Okada) (US 2003/0100347).

Regarding **claim 3**, the combinations of Murata, Yoon and Wyatt teaches all the particulars of the claim except the mobile phone, wherein a telephone service interrupt value is set in said man-machine interface module. However, Okada teaches in an analogous art, the mobile phone, wherein a telephone service interrupt value is set in (Paragraph [0007], line 3) said man-machine interface module (Figure 1. item 24d). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the mobile phone as claimed in claim 1, wherein a telephone service interrupt value is set in said man-machine interface module. This modification makes the phone a multifunctional one (a prayer function and a phone function).

Regarding **claim 4**, the combinations of Murata, Yoon and Wyatt teaches all the particulars of the claim except, wherein said telephone service interrupt value includes an uninterruptible value and a "uninterruptible" value, and if said mobile phone has an incoming call when said processing module is playing said set of prayer voice data, said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to stop playing for answering the incoming call, while said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to

Art Unit: 2617

reject the incoming call and continues playing said set of prayer voice data. However, Okada teaches in an analogous art, wherein said telephone service interrupt value includes an uninterruptible value and a "uninterruptible" value, and if said mobile phone has an incoming call when said processing module is playing said set of prayer voice data, said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to stop playing for answering the incoming call, while said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to reject the incoming call and continues playing said set of prayer voice data (Abstract, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the mobile phone wherein said telephone service interrupt value includes an uninterruptible value and a "uninterruptible" value, and if said mobile phone has an incoming call when said processing module is playing said set of prayer voice data, said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to stop playing for answering the incoming call, while said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to reject the incoming call and continues playing said set of prayer voice data. This modification makes the phone a multifunctional one (a prayer function and a phone function).

Regarding **claim 6**, Murata teaches the mobile phone, further comprising a display module (Paragraph [0051], line 8, item 27 in Figure 7) electrically connected to said processing module (Paragraph [0052], lines 1-2) for displaying religious text data, said religious text data being stored in said memory module (Paragraph [0052], lines 5-7), said processing module being used to retrieve said religious text data and send said

Art Unit: 2617

religious text data to said display module for display (Paragraph [0057], lines 3-10, Paragraph [0058], lines 6-8).

Regarding **claim 7**, Murata teaches, the mobile phone as claimed in claim 2, wherein said memory module is a read-only memory (item 42 in Figure 7) or a flash memory.

Claims 8,10, 11,12,14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (US 2002/0009988) in view of Okada et al. (hereinafter Okada) (US 2003/0100347).

Regarding **claim 8**, Murata teaches a method of playing religious prayers for a mobile phone, comprising: entering a menu having a religious prayers item (Paragraph [0057], line7); selecting at least one set of prayer voice data for playing (Paragraph [0057], line 8); retrieving said set of prayer voice data (Paragraph [0058], line 8); playing said set of prayer voice data (Paragraph [0056], lines 1-3). Murata did not teach specifically, the method comprising: setting a telephone service interrupt value. However, Okada teaches in an analogous art, the method comprising: setting a telephone the service interrupt value (paragraph [0007], line 3). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method comprising: setting a telephone the service interrupt value. This modification makes the phone a multifunctional one (a prayer function and a phone function).

Regarding **claim 10**, Murata in view of Okada teaches all the particulars of the claim 8. Okada did not teach specifically, wherein, said telephone service interrupt value

Art Unit: 2617

includes an interruptible" value and a "uninterruptible" value, and if said mobile phone has an incoming call when said processing module is playing said set of prayer voice data, said "interruptible" value controls said processing module to stop playing for answering the incoming call, while said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to reject the incoming call and continues playing said set of prayer voice data. However, Okada teaches in an analogous art, wherein said telephone service interrupt value includes an interruptible" value and a "uninterruptible" value, and if said mobile phone has an incoming call when said processing module is playing said set of prayer voice data, said "interruptible" value controls said processing module to stop playing for answering the incoming call, while said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to reject the incoming call and continues playing said set of prayer voice data (Abstract, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have said telephone service interrupt value includes an interruptible" value and a "uninterruptible" value, and if said mobile phone has an incoming call when said processing module is playing said set of prayer voice data, said "interruptible" value controls said processing module to stop playing for answering the incoming call, while said "uninterruptible" value controls said processing module to reject the incoming call and continues playing said set of prayer voice data. This modification makes the phone a multifunctional one (a prayer function and a phone function).

Regarding **claim 11**, Murata in view of Okada teaches all the particulars of the claim 8. Okada did not teach specifically, the steps of determining whether an interrupt

Art Unit: 2617

key has been pressed; and stopping playing said set of prayer voice data if an answer is yes; or continuing playing said set of prayer voice data if the answer is no. However, Okada teaches in an analogous art, the steps of determining whether an interrupt key has been pressed; and stopping playing said set voice data if an answer is yes; or continuing playing said set of voice data if the answer is no (Paragraph [0016], lines 1-13; Paragraph [0019], lines 1-3). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the steps of determining whether an interrupt key has been pressed; and stopping playing said set of prayer voice data if an answer is yes; or continuing playing said set of prayer voice data if the answer is no. This modification makes the phone a multifunctional (a prayer function and a phone function) one.

Regarding **claim 12**, Murata teaches a method of displaying religious prayers for a mobile phone (Paragraph [0056], lines 1-3; Paragraph [0058], lines 8-9), comprising: entering a menu having a religious prayers item (Paragraph [0057], lines 7-8); selecting at least one set of religious text data for display (Paragraph [0057], lines 7-8); retrieving said set of religious text data (Paragraph [0058], line 8); and displaying said set of religious text data through operations of a user (Paragraph [0058], line 8-9). Murata did not teach specifically, the method comprising: setting a telephone service interrupt value. However, Okada teaches in an analogous art, the method comprising: setting a telephone the service interrupt value (paragraph [0007], line 3). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method

comprising: setting a telephone the service interrupt value. This modification makes the phone a multifunctional one (a prayer function and a phone function).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

Regarding **claim 15**, Murata further teaches the method as claimed in claim 12, before said step of retrieving said set of religious text data further comprising the steps of: displaying a catalog page of said set of religious text data; and selecting a page of the chapter and section to be displayed (Paragraph [0057], lines 7-9).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata in view of Okada et al. (hereinafter Okada) (US 2003/0100347) and further in view of Lee et al. (hereinafter Lee) (US 6785562).

Regarding **claim 16**, Murata in view of Okada teaches all the particulars of the claim except, wherein said step of displaying said set of data through operations of a user further comprises the steps of: determining whether a PageDown key has been pressed and retrieving said set of data of a next page if an answer is yes; determining whether a PageUp key has been pressed and retrieving said set of data of the previous page if the answer is yes; and determining whether an End key has been pressed and terminating display of said set of data if the answer is yes. However, Lee teaches in an analogous art wherein said step of displaying said set of data through operations of a user further comprises the steps of: determining whether a PageDown key has been pressed and retrieving said set of data of a next page if an answer is yes (Col. 6, lines 38-39); determining whether a PageUp key has been pressed and retrieving said set of

data of the previous page if the answer is yes (Col. 6, lines 38-39); and determining whether an End key has been pressed and terminating display of said set of data if the answer is yes (Col. 6, line 24). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a method wherein said step of displaying said set of data through operations of a user further comprises the steps of: determining whether a PageDown key has been pressed and retrieving said set of data of a next page if an answer is yes; determining whether a PageUp key has been pressed and retrieving said set of data of the previous page if the answer is yes; and determining whether an End key has been pressed and terminating display of said set of data if the answer is yes. This modification makes the system user friendly.

Response to Arguments

The Office acknowledges the correction required on the labeling of claim 11 in the rejection on Page 4 of the Office Action.

Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 11 of the remarks," Reference to line ...data (step108). Applicant is importing limitations from the specification into the claims. The claim language is broad that it can be read to encompass features not described in the written description.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2617

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Muthuswamy G. Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER